UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,451	09/30/2003	Takeshi Inao	P/1071-1600	4123
2352 7590 05/21/2007 OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN				INER
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403		RACHUBA, MAURINA T		
NEW TORK, I	NI 100308403		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			3723	
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/674,451	INAO, TAKESHI		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Maurina Rachuba	3723		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appreciation for Reply	ears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TE OF THIS COMMUN 6(a). In no event, however, may a ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MC cause the application to become A	ICATION reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communic NBANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ma	ay 2007.			
<u> </u>	action is non-final.	•		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	tters, prosecution as to the meri	ts is		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 15,16,18 and 20-28 is/are pending in t	he application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•			
6) Claim(s) <u>15,16,18 and 20-28</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/a	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)	objected to by the Examiner.	•	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	Irawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	•			
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-15	2.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•		
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
1 ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		Annlication No		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori		· ·	2	
application from the International Bureau		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of		t received.		
		·		
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	(s)/Mail Date			
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)     Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)	Informal Patent Application		
S. Patent and Trademark Office	· <del></del>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

Application/Control Number: 10/674,451

Art Unit: 3723

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

1. The finality of the Office action mailed 30 January 2007 is withdrawn. Previously presented claim 19 was inadvertently left out of the previous Office action. The claims filed 10 May 2007 have been entered. Please refer to the new rejections below.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 4. Claims 15, 16, and 18-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sommer, 4,955,163 in view of Nagata, 5,343,626 and Pflager et al, 5,443,413. '163 discloses an apparatus for polishing side faces of grooves formed on a workpiece comprising: a fixture, figures 12 and 14, for fixing the workpiece; a rotating shaft disposed in a horizontal direction of the fixture; a rotary driving unit for rotating the

Art Unit: 3723

rotating shaft; a disc polishing element having abrasive grains thereon for polishing the side faces of the grooves, figure 10, the polishing element being fixed to the rotating shaft; wherein the disk polishing element has the abrasive grains on a side face thereof for polishing the workpiece, figure 10, and the disk polishing element further comprises abrasive grains at a peripheral edge thereof for cutting the workpiece, figure 10; a driving unit, figure 14, for moving at least one of the rotating shaft and the workpiece in the vertical direction, horizontally in the longitudinal direction of the rotating shaft, and in the longitudinal direction of the grooves along the side faces of the grooves; and a detector, column 12, lines 30 through column 14, lines 33, for detecting the position where the polishing element is in contact with the workpiece. Note that by detecting the position of the carriages, the position where the polishing element is in contact with the workpiece is detected. '163 does not disclose moving the rotating shaft and/or workpiece horizontally in the longitudinal direction of the grooves. In order for the shaft and/or workpiece to be moved horizontally in the longitudinal direction of the grooves. the workpiece of '163 must be placed so that its longitudinal axis is horizontal, so that the grooves have a horizontal component. '626, in a similar device, figure 2, teaches that it is old and well known to mount a grooved workpiece such that the grooves have a horizontal longitudinal direction along the side faces of the grooves. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided '163 with the workpiece placement taught by '626, figure 2, with the workpiece oriented so that the grooves have a longitudinal, horizontal component, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70. '163 does not Art Unit: 3723

disclose that the sensor is a Hall sensor (interpreted as a Hall effect sensor). In a grinding apparatus, '413 teaches that Hall effect sensors are old and well known for measuring the position of one element relative to another, column 3, lines 9-11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided '163 with a Hall sensor as the sensor to measure the position of the polishing element relative to the workpiece, as taught by p413, column 3 lines 9-11, as one of many known position sensors available to applicant at the time the invention was made, to allow accurate sensing of the position of the tool.

5. Further, '163 does not disclose the cutting depth of the abrasive grains. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided '163 with grains having a size in the claimed range, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Here, the size of the grain can be dependent on the properties of the material being processed, the desired processing time, and the desired surface finish.

## Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15, 16 and 18-28 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The examiner agrees that '333 does not disclose the invention as now claimed, however, it is the examiner's position that the claimed invention is obvious over '163, as modified by '626 and '413. '413 teaches that the use of Hall effect sensors are old and well known for

determining relative position by measuring an electrical characteristic of a rotary driving unit of the tool, for accurate positioning of the tool.

## Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurina Rachuba whose telephone number is 571 272 4493. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571 272 4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3723

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Maurina Rachuba Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3723